CANDOUR *The British Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 39, No 6. *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* June, 1988.

THE SHOOTER

WHILE large advertisements have been appearing in the news media asking readers to forward to the Home Secretary information about alleged war criminals resident in the U.K. who might have been responsible for "genocide, murder or manslaughter in Germany or German-occupied territories" during World War II, a curious silence prevails concerning other types of war criminal. We have in mind particularly those individuals responsible for perpetrating outrages against British personnel and troops in Palestine. The following report is about the criminal background of Yitzhak Shamir, Israel's present Prime Minister, and is taken in slightly adapted form from "Focus", a publication of Wiswell Ruffin House (P.O. Box 236, Dresden, NY, USA 14441).

THE visit of Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Shamir (real name Itzhak Yezernitsky) to the U.S. in March was proof that none of the power of this Pole has diminished, even in the face of the shoot-to-kill pogrom his regime is conducting against the Palestinians.

Shamir's imperial nay to Secretary of State George Schultz's token diplomacy is characteristic of this arch-terrorist whose most infamous murder was the assassination of U.N. mediator Count Folke Bernadotte in Palestine on September 16, 1948. Bernadotte was on a mission of peace, seeking to end the battles between Jews and Palestinians which had engulfed the former British mandate territory, when he was machine gunned to death on orders from the three-man executive committee of the 'Fighters for the Freedom of Israel', known inside Palestine by its Hebrew acronym Lehi and to the outside world as the Stern Gang. The three terror commanders were Israel Shreib, Nathan Friedman-Yellin and Itzhak Yezernitsky a.k.a. Shamir.

In 1944 the same triumvirate ordered the assassination in Egypt of Walter Edward Guiness, Lord Moyne - the British Minister of State in the Middle East, member of Churchill's cabinet and owner of the Guiness brewery. The assassination followed the murder of several British soldiers during the time that General Erwin Rommel's Afrika Korps was hard-pressed by the British forces. Was it part of a plan by the Stern Gang to open a "second front" against Britain on Hitler's behalf? In between his stints as Stern Gang chief of operations, Shamir was an accomplished bank robber much admired by the Zionist underground for his courage and daring. His nickname was "the Shooter". The Palestine police issued a "wanted" poster for Shamir who spent several months as a fugitive from justice, hiding in various Stern safehouses.

In a 1977 interview, Shamir told the historian Nicholas Bethell that murdering Lord Moyne "without doubt...helped the Jewish cause. Governments don't give attention to any problem until such sharp methods are used. Otherwise nothing is done. There are times when you have to use such methods."

This writer, among many other journalists, has tried to force the U.S. media establishment - in-between its pontificating about Kurt Waldheim - to present the facts about Shamir's background as a terrorist to the American people. The American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (A.D.C.) finally managed to smash the paper-curtain in a March 12 article in the **Los Angeles Times** which focussed on the group's lawsuit against the U.S. Government to compel it to release its documentary files on Shamir's bloody past. A.D.C. head Abdeen Jabara called on the U.S. Immigration Service to ban Shamir from entering the country and place him on its "watch list" because of his terrorist past. In testimony to just how explosive Shamir's record is for the "Holocaust" industry and the conservative "anti-terrorist" types like Senator Jesse Helms - both of which continue to link the state of Israel with justice, sanctity and apple pie - the media did not whimper one additional line about Shamir's record during the whole of his visit. Compare this with the repeated questions to this day confronting Jesse Jackson about his "Hymie" remark or Louis Farrakhan's "gutter religion" jibe. And these were comments, not acts of murder!

"Troublesome" Palestinians

Even less attention was given to a very interesting high-level strategy session Shamir conducted with fifty top Hollywood insiders on March 18 at the Four Seasons Hotel where ways of limiting damage to the Zionist public relations image, generated by graphic footage of the massacre in Palestine, were discussed. At the meeting Shamir dismissed the hundred or more Palestinian civilians murdered by the Israeli army as "troublesome". It looks terrible and it is terrible, but there's no other way to counter violent means - you have to use violent measures... There are no easy, simple answers."

Unless, of course, the resistance fighters are Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto or blacks in Johannesburg. Then the simple answers flow from the pens of the same media moguls who cite existential shades of grey when Shamir's stormtroopers blast away at Palestinian flesh. The leftists pour into the streets when Reagan sends troops to Honduras but can muster only a few hundred to picket Shamir in Los Angeles. Left and right are Pavlovian dogs. If the media cues aren't there, if an image-precedent has not been repeatedly imprinted via television for a cause, Americans are paralysed. Bet your last buck that the streets of this nation would be jammed with protesters of all political shades if in the same timespan one hundred Jews had been shot to death in Moscow or one hundred blacks shot by the Botha regime.

Readers who wondered why we counselled against involvement in the Presidential primary circus have only to look at the cowardice of the somnabulistic debates between the contenders who focussed on everything but Palestine in their televised meetings. These are the same politicians who are the first to yap about the "horrible insensitivity of those who were silent during the Holocaust". Palestinian blood is mighty cheap. What a farce is "human rights" in our world!

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. $12 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

BRINGING HOME THE NEW EUROPE

BRUCE Oldfield (Princess Di's couturier) is - so are Alan Sugar of Amstrad and Sir John Egan, the chairman of Jaguar... European, that is. Television viewers will realise they have taken to the airwaves in an advertising campaign which Mrs. Thatcher hopes will make us ready for a Europe without frontiers. Britain's new generation of thrusting yuppie entrepreneurs are being persuaded that their future lies in the single, economically integrated Europe which is scheduled to arrive in 1992. The £5m push to give us all a Euro-outlook is being sponsored by the Department of Trade and Industry, which fears that most of us are unprepared to exploit the "huge opportunities" that will follow the tearing down of trade restrictions. A D.T.I. survey last October revealed that only 16 per cent of British companies even knew significant changes were in the offing.

So 1992 is to be the year of the European Big Bang, the year of wonders in which, from Cape Wrath to Crete, the European internal market is to be "perfected". Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the European Commission, has gone to war with 286 legislative cannon, designed to blow concealed protection out of its trenches. In another move to make 1992 as urgent a deadline over here as in France or Germany, the General Secretary of the European Movement, Mr. Peter Luff, has been deluging local newspaper offices with letters announcing that Europe is "open for business". One such appeared in the **Newbury Weekly News** at the end of March, which drew forth this trenchant response from Miss Marie Endean, Hon. Secretary of the British Anti-Common Market Campaign:

"MR. Luff, General Secretary of the European Movement, dazzles us with the prospect of selling direct to 320 million people in the integrated Common Market and tells us to be prepared for products from France, Germany and Italy that "will arrive" on our supermarket shelves in 1992 - and not only on our supermarket shelves, I may add.

"Does he not realise that we are already so surfeited with such goods that our present annual trading loss with the E.C. is around £9 billion? More and more juggernauts will pound our roads, each doing as much damage to the surface fabric as 250,000 small family saloons (**Sunday Times**, April 3)? Along with the rest of us, the average British businessman is circumscribed by the monstrous burden of the Common Agricultural Policy which in itself is a hidden poll tax costing each family of four at very least £145.60 a year. Only last week our M.E.P., Dr. Caroline Jackson, admitted that the recent so-called reforms are not likely to stick (**Newbury Business Review**, March 31). Furthermore, we are saddled with an E.C. budget which has run into deficit of well over £4 billion, a budget described by the House of Lords select committee on financing the European Community as "fundamentally flawed" (**HL Paper 14**, 1987). So there is a syndrome of adverse factors threatening us.

"The integrated market bids fair to become the promised land for corporate raiders. "C.B.I. fears Britain may lose out in E.E.C. reforms," reported **The Daily Telegraph** on February 29. "Takeover risk in E.E.C." warned **The Times** (March 21) quoting the fears of a leading broker that British electronic companies moving into Europe are likely to become targets for cross-border take-overs. Indeed, the more successful the companies, the greater the danger for them."

CUT AND THRUST

by JANUS

IF a group of far-sighted M.E.P.s at the Strasbourg Paper-Mountain have their way, the only history text our children are likely to use in the future will be called something like "1992 And All That". Their proposal is for a standard Euro-history book to be issued in all E.E.C. schools. That way, they claim, children will acquire a European rather than a national perspective on events. The French and the Spanish and the Dutch are all apparently in favour. So why aren't we? After all, wasn't the result of the Armada a draw, with the Spaniards having to play against the wind? Wasn't Trafalgar merely a minor naval skirmish, named after a well-known square in central London? Far superior to the national distortions of the likes of Bryant will be the collective wisdom of a Euro-committee dedicated to reminding us of the contributions to Britain's heritage of the Italians under Caesar or the Dutch under William. Only then can the nation-state finally be laid to rest in the minds of the rising generation. Wasn't it Orwell who wrote, "He who controls the past controls the future"? His big mistake was to mis-title his brilliant work eight years too soon!

* * * *

IT would be interesting to know how many of the 300 or so M.P.s who were prepared to frustrate David Alton's Abortion (Amendment) Bill, thereby presumably approving the killing of the innocents, will be voting against capital punishment and the killing of the guilty.

* * * *

AFTER a wait of almost sixteen months, the controversial play "Perdition" finally had its first full public performance last month. Its author, Jim Allen, puts forward the thesis that some prominent Jews connived in the 'Holocaust' in the interests of building a homeland for themselves in Israel. Zionism equals Nazism seems a hellish equation. It fuelled sufficient protests to get it suppressed at the Royal Court Theatre ostensibly because of "factual errors" which the dramatist had refused to correct. True or not, that hardly seemed justification for denying that Allen's thesis deserved examination. Are we to conclude some facts are more sacred than others? Twenty years ago, the Royal Court put on a play in which Queen Victoria raped [sic] Florence Nightingale and strangled Prince Albert with her garter! They were not so fastidious then. Despite the abuse of his critics, Jim Allen denies he is what is labelled "anti-Semitic". All the books he read in two years of research were by Jews, he says, and adds that his main support throughout the project has come from anti-Zionist Jews. Yet so sacred is the ground on which he treads that his aim to get the play staged in Israel itself seems unduly ambitious.

* * * *

ON the radio I heard a Christian Aid female big-wig being made a great fuss of, particularly over her marvellous "Christian Aid version of the Lord's Prayer". She proudly recited part of it, which I don't remember very well, beginning "Our Father" (or was it "O Spirit" or something?) "Which art within us" (yes!) and continuing in a human-centred, mater-

ialist, politicised way to "those who trespass against us". I don't think anything like forgiving them got a look-in: they were in this version quite simply "our enemies"! Readers will understand my shocked surprise that such caring Christian Aiders should express themselves so "un-Christianly" about anyone. But then came pleasant surprise that such liberals should be tough-minded enough to call things by their right name and use the perfectly Biblical term "enemy". Finally it dawned that the whole tenor of this non-Paternoster had made it clear that the enemy, for whom no lesser term, nor any term, could be strong enough condemnation, would be Right-wing rulers, racists and Rosines!

* * * *

THE White parents, reported in the **Daily Telegraph** on 6th May, who complained that their six-year-old children could count to 20 in Punjabi, but who could not do so in English, are being short-sighted. By the time that these children are seeking employment, the ability to count in Punjabi will be an advantage, if not an actual legal requirement. If the parents of Moslem children objected to their offspring being present at a Christian religious festival, would they be ignored? Not if I know it!

* * * *

RECENT protests about the lack of a "homosexual element" in the study of history and geography have been loudly derided, but some stuffy old party poopers will get all huffy and upset about anything, won't they? And never mind the gay history: what about some gay geology, physics or maths? Can't you just picture it? "Jeremy is re-covering his sofa with a rather nice chintz, so he invites Alastair and Gordon round to help. If it took Jeremy 2.4 hours to cover one cushion, how long will it take to cover three cushions and the sofa itself if: (a) all three work steadily? (b) Gordon goes off in a huff because Jeremy is paying Alastair all the attention? (c) Sandy turns up, all black leather and chains like Marlon Brando, sneers at the chinz and recommends that the sofa be covered in a dark grey sateen?" Doesn't it just make you want to be young again in a nice anti-homophobic borough, my dear reader?

* * * *

BEDFORDSHIRE'S Chief Constable, Mr. Alan Dyer, has caused a storm by saying a woman's place is in the home and if fewer of them worked the crime rate would fall. "The sooner they realise that being a housewife is a full-time job, the sooner we may be able to get some of these lawless kids off the streets," he said. How true! Very few jobs compare in the long term in importance or satisfaction with that of housewife or mother. The true wealth of society cannot be counted in simple material terms, but in the quality of life that the children of the next generation will inherit. Yet in today's materialistic society too few women have the option of devoting some part of their lives to that vocation because in order to survive and pay the bills both partners in a marriage must work. Mrs. Thatcher, I see, has recently adopted the role of Champion of the Family, rightly describing it as "the building-block of society". Why, then, does she not address the issue of why the whole basis of family life is being eroded? Of course, she will not, for were she to do so, very rapidly it would become evident that behind the pressures of the "rat race" is the evil of usury. And no party politician would dare champion the interests of the family against that!

THE VIRTUE OF KINGSHIP

1988 is the tercentenary of the (In)Glorious Revolution, when even some of our colleagues in the Cause find occasion to rejoice that "the tyrannical James II was supplanted by William and the true seeds of Parliamentary democracy were sown"! In fact, 1688 witnessed the deposing of the legitimate Sovereign of this country by a powerful moneyed Whig establishment and his replacement by a compliant foreign usurper, ready to endorse their factional interests. Perhaps the only truly accurate life and description of James II that has ever been written - a most inspiring picture, too - is **King James The Last** by Jane Lane, an erstwhile political colleague of A.K. Chesterton. She was a very considerable historian and her original research brought to light material long suppressed by the anti-Catholic forces that dominate the English-speaking world. In a modest effort to help rehabilitate James, who was clearly one of England's greatest kings, we re-print below a review of Miss Lane's book that we have recently discovered published in the Duke of Northumberland's journal, **The Patriot**, on July 13th., 1944.

IN **The Governance of England**, brought out forty years ago, Sidney Low wrote: "There is certainly no such thing as the English monarchy, as it is represented in the Statute, in the courts of law, and in proclamations, orders in council, and formal documents in general. The Government of this country is not that of a semi-divine despot. The Sovereign who is the hereditary and ceremonial head of a parliamentary democracy has many privileges and attributes of the highest importance; but the tremendous powers technically ascribed to him he does not possess. They belong to a convenient myth, which is called the Crown, but might almost as well be called the Nation, or the Will of the People, or any other suitable abstraction."

English kingship ceased to exist in December 1688, and as Miss Jane Lane points out in her **King James The Last**, an institution cannot be preserved by preserving its name. Nothing more than the outward show of kingship survives, and that survives on account of the ineradicable preference of the English people for the monarchical form of government.

Merciless Hatred Of A Moneyed Aristocracy

As a summary of this interesting book it can be noted that the author's viewpoint is that neither the character nor the history of the least understood of all the Stuarts can be properly assessed except in relation to the principle for which he stood. The author traces the history of kingship in England up to the birth of James and reveals the development of the relentless war which a moneyed aristocracy waged against it. Confounding Whig historians, she shows that it was solely because of James' refusal to compromise with this cardinal principle that he aroused the merciless hatred of that class while he was still Duke of York; and how, when he came to the throne, his determination to exercise the essential function of kingship - to rule - drove that class to bring over a foreign usurper, in whose name they themselves would wield power thereafter. Consistently he was an advocate for religious toleration, and as consistently was he opposed by the Church of England and his advisers. The fall of James the Second, contends Miss Lane, was accompanied simultaneously by the fall of the most ancient

and universally accepted form of government, to be supplanted by vested interests, party politics, and the rule of a clique. Miss Lane makes it clear how James, by virtue of his kingship, always had the support of his people, except on those occasions when vile propaganda had stirred them out of their balance. But always was there the difficulty of gauging the loyalty of the people until too late.

On his deathbed King James summed up his conception of kingship, for the benefit of his son, in the following terms: "Remember a King ought to be the Father of his people, and must have a fatherly tenderness for them... No King can be happy without his Subjects be at ease, and the people cannot be secure of enjoying their own without the King be at ease also, and in a position to protect them and secure his own right; therefore preserve your own prerogative, but disturb not the Subjects in their Property, nor conscience, remember the great precept, Do as you would be done to... our blessed Saviour whipt people out of the Temple, but I never heard he commanded any should be forced into it... Study the trade of the Nation, and encourage it by all Lawfull means, 'tis that which will make you at ease at home and considerable abroad, and preserve the Mastery of the Sea, for without that England cannot be safe."

Nowadays, if the King had restored to him the powers which he wielded from the dim beginnings of history until the end of the seventeenth century, he would be termed a tyrant. Such has been the power of propaganda that the belief is now firmly fixed that the government of England without a Parliamentary system is inconceivable, but, as Lowell has written: "No one has yet devised a method of working that system without a central figure, powerless no doubt, but beyond the reach of party strife."

William's Perjured Soul

It would be hard to prove that King James on dying had not a proper conception of his duty to the people. It would not be so easy to prove that our present Parliamentary system works in a manner which always has such duties as the first consideration. There is indeed a lesson to be learned from Miss Lane's book. What she describes as Aristocracy destroyed the Monarchy. Aristocracy is now in process of destruction by what is called Democracy, but is in reality an oligarchy recruited from the ranks of rich and influential men, a variety of oligarchy which Aristotle described long ago as the worst of all systems. The English people have the habit of adjusting their Constitution to their requirements, but Miss Lane's book leaves the feeling that they acted not too wisely in allowing their lawful King to be forced to abdicate and his place taken by a man who was his nephew as well as his son-in-law. That man, William of Orange, lived to realise that his treachery had not brought him his ambition, the desire to be a real King. Miss Lane thus describes his real position: "The desire to be a King had been at the root of all his actions. To gratify that desire he had perjured his soul, he had sold his honour, he had broken his word, he had deceived, he had bribed, and it seemed that he had realised his ambition. But it was not so. He had eaten his mess of potage, and it was gall in his belly. He had become a puppet; nothing more. It was not he who had conquered kingly government; it was an oligarchy; and that oligarchy was his master. His throne was his not through hereditary principle, but as the gift of a class. To that class he was, and must remain, a servant."

ANTIPODEAN OUTBURST

"APARTHEID, modern slavery" -
The judgement of a prince,
To comfort aborigines
Whilst Aussies wryly wince?
Perhaps in far-off Palestine
Some Arabs dispossessed
Might hanker for a royal word
On status more distressed!
But he who shoots the tiger
Yet sitting in the chair
Of fund to save the animals,
Runs where no angel dare.
A censure for South Africa,
For Palestine no plea
And indigenous British
Once anathemised as "free"
Are geared to total treason
Yet princes have no word
For kingdom torn to tatters,
A heritage interred.
A slavery most ancient
For Britain is the score;
A prince might more selectively
Speak out to close that door.

B.E. BIGGS

B-TESTS FOR EURO MPs?

RADICAL Euro M.P. Roberto Ciciomessere of Italy has accused colleagues of drinking too much before parliamentary sessions at Strasbourg. According to the **Sunday Express**, he's demanding breathalyser tests before they enter the debating chamber. "I am fed up with drunks shouting and talking nonsense," he said. One more reason for abstaining in every sense as far as the wretched EC is concerned, surely?

OH, CALAMITY!

WICKED Zola Budd! One newspaper pointed out that her accent betrayed the fact that her native tongue was Afrikaans. Is further proof needed of her perfidy? How can she bear to look decent people in the face? We cannot remember whether Dante had a Hell resserved for hypocrites. If so, it will soon be full to overflowing!

W A R N I N G :

USURY CAN DAMAGE YOUR WEALTH

CANDOUR reader Brian Holmes appeared at Horseferry Road Magistrate's Court on May 25th to answer a charge of criminal damage to the wall of a London bank after police claimed he painted "Usurers" on it. His defence was that public duty demanded that banks should carry warnings as poison bottles and cigarette packets are forced to do. Usury has more dangers that are less publicised. Unconvinced, magistrates fined Brian £75. **Candour** paid his fine, but if readers would care to contribute we should be immensely grateful. Please send any donations to **Candour** at the address below.

REMEMBER: WE DON'T LIVE IN A CREDIT SOCIETY - WE LIVE IN A DEBT SOCIETY.

AND AS FOR 1992...

POLITICIANS and the media are saying "Welcome to the United States of Europe". I say, "To Hell with it!" I am in my 80th year. I arrived when the British Empire was at its zenith - a greater force for good the world has never known. I have lived to see it disappear, to be accompanied now by once-Great Britain.

I have no desire to quit this sphere but I hope I shall not be here in 1992 when, thanks to the Single European Act (passed by the Conservative Government), the final chapter will be written. If I could be granted a dying wish, it would be, for the sakes of those who follow me, that Edward Heath, Lord Cockfield and those other politicians who have sold us down the river be tried for high treason. [The penalty for which is still death - Editor.]

FRANK BARTER

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle.)